

1
2
3
4 TESLA, INC.,

5 Plaintiff,

6 v.

7 PROCEPTION, INC., et al.,

8 Defendants.

9 Case No. 25-cv-04963-SVK

10 **TENTATIVE RULING ON**
EXPEDITED DISCOVERY

11 Re: Dkt. No. 15

12 Before the Court is Tesla, Inc.’s (“Tesla”) Motion for Expedited Discovery (the “Motion”)
13 sought in support of its preliminary injunction. Dkt. 15. The Parties have submitted briefing in
14 accordance with this Court’s scheduling order, (Dkt. 37), and the Court now provides the follow
15 **TENTATIVE RULING** in advance of the July 3, 2025 hearing.16 Defendants’ arguments that Tesla’s claims are not sufficiently supported and that Tesla has
17 caused its own exigency are not clearly relevant to five factors of the “good cause” analysis
18 governing the Motion; they are better addressed as arguments on the merits of whether a
19 preliminary injunction should issue. Tesla has shown good cause for expedited discovery in
20 support of its preliminary injunction motion, with limitations arising out of Defendants’ valid
21 concerns regarding the breadth of Tesla’s requests and the burden on Defendants.¹22 Accordingly, the Court is inclined to **GRANT-IN-PART** and **DENY-IN-PART** Tesla’s
23 requested expedited discovery, as follows:24 • The Court **GRANTS** RFP no. 1 and Interrogatory nos. 1-2, subject to a sufficiently
25 tailored definition of the information at issue. As just one example, documents and26
27

¹ Defendants’ argument that one of Tesla’s asserted purposes, the prevention of document
28 destruction, is unsupported at this stage is also well-taken; indeed, Tesla does not stand on this
purpose in its reply. However, Tesla’s other purposes remain valid and, at best, this issue goes to
the urgency of the expedited discovery but does not defeat the propriety thereof.

United States District Court
Northern District of California

communications relating to Tesla’s “Optimus” project would be appropriate. The Parties shall **meet and confer and be prepared to discuss proposals to narrow these discovery requests at the hearing;**

- The Court **DENIES for purposes of expedited discovery, without prejudice**, RFP no. 2. The proper scope of this RFP is covered by a narrowed form of RFP no. 1;
- The Court **DENIES for purposes of expedited discovery, without prejudice**, RFP No. 3 and Tesla's requests for a complete forensic investigation as lacking good cause due to breadth and burden;
- The Court **GRANTS** RFP No. 4;
- The Court **DENIES for purposes of expedited discovery, without prejudice**, Interrogatory no. 3 as cumulative of Interrogatory no. 2; and
- The Court **GRANTS** a deposition of Defendant Li and a 30(b)(6) deposition of Defendant Proception, consistent with RFP no. 1 and Interrogatory nos. 1-2 as granted. The Parties should **meet and confer** as to an appropriate scope for these depositions and **be prepared to discuss such scope at the hearing**.

The Court further **ORDERS** as follows:

The Parties are to be prepared to address the definitions of “Tesla’s Proprietary Information” and “Tesla’s information,” as used in Tesla’s proposed requests and deposition notices, at the hearing.

The Parties are to **discuss and propose a timeline, or competing timelines if they cannot reach agreement**, for the expedited discovery to be completed.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 2, 2025

Susan van Keulen
SUSAN VAN KEULEN
United States Magistrate Judge